

10th August 1965]

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS—*cont.*

(2) THE MADRAS AGRICULTURAL INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1965.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to announce to the House that the Governor has given his recommendation to the introduction in the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Agricultural Income-tax (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

4-30
p.m.

VII—GOVERNMENT BILLS—*cont.*

(5) THE MADRAS AGRICULTURAL INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL,
1965.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Agricultural Income-tax (Amendment) Bill, 1965 and move—

“ that the Bill a be taken into consideration ”.

Sir, in the Madras Plantations Agricultural Income-tax (Amendment) Act, 1958, which extended the provisions of the main Act to crops other than plantation crops, a special provision was included in section 34, to collect tax from agriculturists for the assessment year 1958-59, applying the composition formula, i.e., without detailed assessment of the income derived. This is because agriculturists do not generally maintain proper accounts. The above provision was subsequently extended for the assessment years upto 1965-66. Similarly in the Madras Agricultural Income-tax (Extension to Added Territory) Act, 1961, which extended the provisions of the main Act to the territories added to this State from the State of Andhra Pradesh, provision was included in section 14, to allow the agriculturists in those territories to compound the tax for the assessment year 1961-62. The above provision was subsequently extended up to the assessment year 1965-66.

It has been considered necessary to extend the benefit of section 34 of the Madras Plantations Agricultural Income-tax (Amendment) Act, 1958 and section 14 of the Madras Agricultural Income-tax (Extension to Added Territory) Act, 1961 in respect of the assessment years 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69 by suitably amending the said sections. The Bill provides for this.

Sir, I request the House to accept the motion.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved—

“ That the Madras Agricultural Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1965 be taken into consideration. ”

* SRI C. CHIRANJEEVULU NAIDU : Sir, I would like to say a few words on this Bill.

[Sri C. Chiranjeevulu Naidu] [10th August 1965]

The revenue derived from agricultural income-tax is rather small and it cannot be considered to be remunerative when compared to the huge cost of establishment that is being maintained for the purpose. It is for consideration whether it would not be desirable to entrust this work of collection of agricultural income-tax to the regular Revenue staff. We are now collecting land revenue at the taluk level. Further, the Land Ceiling Act is going to be implemented in the near future and whether the collection of this tax could not be done by those officers may be considered. In that case, we may dispense with the Agricultural Income-tax Officers.

As regards the application of the Act to the territories added to this State, I would like to say a few words. Provision has been made for compounding the tax. Such a provision is good and is useful to the agriculturists. But it is said that if they fail to compound the tax within a particular period, they are asked to submit accounts to the Officers. The agriculturists find it difficult to write the accounts. I therefore request that a grace time of at least two months may be given for agreeing to the compounding.

I request that the above points may kindly be considered.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, even the one hon. Member, who participated in the discussion, has no objection to the present extension. He has actually welcomed the Bill and has also appreciated the provision for compounding. The other points which he raised with regard to the cost of collection and the future of this Act will all depend upon the implementation of the land Ceiling legislation. As I have just now stated, the full effect of the Land Ceiling Act will be known in the next one or two years. When a general review is made, then we may consider whether the compounding provision is necessary or not. Till then, the present Act and the compounding provision will continue. I do not think that the hon. Member will have any objection to this.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

“That the Madras Agricultural Income-tax (Amendment) Bill, 1965 be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clauses 2 and 3 were put and carried.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH: Sir, I move.

“That the Madras Agricultural Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1965 be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

10th August 1965]

(6) THE HOLDINGS (STAY OF EXECUTION PROCEEDINGS) (MADRAS AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Sir, I beg to introduce the Holdings (Stay of Execution Proceedings) (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1965, and move—

‘ that the Bill a be taken into consideration ’.

The Holdings (Stay of Execution Proceedings) Act, 1950 (Travancore-Cochin Act VIII of 1950) was in force in the Kanyakumari district and Shencottah taluk at the time of their transferred to this State from the former Travancore-Cochin State in 1956. Consequent on the extension to the Shencottah taluk of the Cultivating Tenants Protection and Fair Rent Acts by Madras Act 28 of 1959 with effect from 2nd March 1960, the Holdings (Stay of Execution Proceedings) Act ceased to be in force in the taluk. It is now in force only in the Kanyakumari district.

The Act provides for the stay of proceedings in execution of a decree in a suit for the recovery of possession of a holding, so far as they relate to the delivery of possession of the holding.

The Act is due to expire on the 24th September 1965. We have recently passed certain Acts for the abolition of certain special tenures prevalent in the Kanyakumari district and for the introduction of Ryotwari settlement therein and the lines of the Ryotwari settlement prevalent in the rest of the State. Pending the implementation of these Acts and pending the abolition of the special tenure relating to Sreepadam lands in Kanyakumari district for which legislation has yet to be undertaken, it is considered necessary to extend the life of Travancore-Cochin Act VIII of 1950 by two years from the 25th September 1965. The Bill seeks to achieve the above object.

I request the House, Sir, to accept and pass the motion moved by me.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“ That the Holdings (Stay of Execution Proceedings) (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1965, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Sir, I move—

“ That the Holdings (Stay of Execution Proceedings) (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1965, be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary,
dated 22nd July 1965.

[10th August 1965]

VIII.—ANNOUNCEMENTS—*cont.*

(3) THE MADRAS MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS BILL, 1965.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to announce to the House that the Governor has given his recommendation for the consideration by the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Medical Practitioners Bill, 1965.

VII.—GOVERNMENT BILLS—*cont.*

(7) THE MADRAS MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS BILL, 1965.

(L.A. BILL NO. 22 OF 1965.)

* THE HON. SRINATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM: Sir, I move—

“ That the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained for setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses, consisting of 18 members (12 members of the Legislative Assembly and 6 members of the Legislative Council) to consider the Madras Medical Practitioners Bill*, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 22 of 1965), and that the following Members of the Legislative Assembly be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

1. The Hon. Srimathi Jothi Vencatachellum.
2. Sri K. S. G. Haja Sheriff.
3. Sri P. Ramachandran.
4. Sri M. Alagiriswamy.
5. Sri P. R. Sreenivasa Padayachi.
6. Sri R. Ponnappa Nadar.
7. Sri K. P. Palaniswamy.
8. Sri R. Rangaswamy.
9. Sri Rama Arangannal.
10. Sri S. Murugaiyan.
11. Sri K. R. Nallasivam.
12. Sri P. K. Mookiah Thevar.

Sir, hon. Members are aware that at present, there are in force in the State of Madras two enactments providing for the registration of medical practitioners. They are—

(1) The Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914 (Madras Act IV of 1914), and

(2) The Madras Registration of Practitioners of Integrated Medicine Act, 1956 (Madras Act XXVII of 1956).

The former Act provides for the establishment of a Medical Council and for the registration of Medical Practitioners of Modern Medicine who possess recognised qualifications. The latter Act provides for the establishment of the Board of Integrated Medicine, Madras, and also for the registration of